



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/576,071

04/14/2006

Paul Hibbard

P08906US00/DEJ

7363

881 7590 04/10/2008

STITES & HARBISON PLLC  
1199 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET  
SUITE 900  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

KERSHTEYN, IGOR

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3745

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/10/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/576,071	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HIBBARD, PAUL	
	<b>Examiner</b> Igor Kershteyn	<b>Art Unit</b> 3745	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 9-13, 15-21, 24-26, 28 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-8, 14, 22, 23, 27, 29 and 31-33 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 May 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/14/2006</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is not submitted on a separate sheet of paper. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2, 3, 9-11, 15-18, 20, 21, 28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 26, and 30, the phrases "such as", "preferably", and "more preferably" render the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claims 24-26 provides for the use of a member and number of members, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under

Art Unit: 3745

35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim 28 recites the limitation "said optional contact-enhancing layer" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 is rejected by virtue of it's dependency on claim 15.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 12, 13, 19, and 2, 3, 11, 15, 20, 21, and 24-26, as far as they are definite, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen (6,457,943) in view of Merz (4,944,655).

Olsen, in figures 1-5, teaches a member for potential equalizing between a first conducting member (1,2,3) and a second conducting member (1,2,3) of a wind turbine blade comprising an electrical conductor (5), a first contact part (6) for providing a potential equalizing connection between said first conducting member of said wind turbine blade and said electrical conductor, second contact part (6) for providing a potential equalizing connection between a second conducting member of said wind

Art Unit: 3745

turbine blade and said electrical conductor and said first conducting member comprises carbon fibres.

Olsen doesn't teach the said first contact part is shaped substantially as a ribbon.

Merz, in figures 1-5, teaches a blade having a contact part 5 shaped as a ribbon.

Since Olsen and Merz are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is the blade lightning protection art, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the contact part of Olsen with the ribbon shape as taught by Merz for the purpose of providing more compact arrangement.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 4-8, 14, 22, 23, 27, 29, and 31-33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 9, 10, 16-18, 28, and 30 are would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Prior Art***

Prior art made of record but not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure and consist of three patents.

US 5,800,129 is cited to show a blade having a lightning protection.

US 5,863,181 is cited to show a blade having a lightning protection.

US 6,102,662 is cited to show a blade having a lightning protection.

***Contact information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Kershteyn whose telephone number is **(571)272-4817**. The examiner can be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Look, can be reached on **(571)272-4820**. The fax number is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308 0861.

/Igor Kershteyn/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3745